APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/544,111	08/02/2005	Yoichi Takaragi	03500.017897	9407

5514   7590   09/29/2008
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER
HON, MING Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2625	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/29/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 August 2005*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are pending in the application.
   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *02 August 2005* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
   a)☒ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

>   (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
>   section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
>   such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
>   having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
>   manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 1, 9-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu et al.

US2002/0042884 hereinafter referred to as Wu and view of Davis et al. USPN 6965682

hereinafter referred to as Davis.

3.   As per Claim 1, Wu teaches a data processing method of an image processing system in

which a server apparatus and a data processing apparatus communicate with each

other to perform a predetermined data process, (Wu, Figure 1, Component 101, 102) comprising:

       a storing step of storing an electronic data in the data processing apparatus; (Wu, Figure

1, Component [0014] and Figure 22, "sender")

       a first transmission step of transmitting original specifying information including the

feature information extracted in said first extraction step and a user ID for discriminating a print

requester of the electronic data (Wu, Paragraph [0026], [0036], and [0033], User ID can be

considered as seal of the user)

       a control step of controlling generation of print data to be output to the printer apparatus,

on the basis of original certification information notified by the server apparatus and the

electronic

data stored in the data processing apparatus; (Wu, Paragraph [0036] and [0126])

and a print step of causing the printer apparatus to print the print data generated in said control step and information indicating that the print data corresponds to an original. (Wu, Paragraph [0040])

Wu does not teach a first extraction step of extracting a feature information of the electronic data to be output to a printer apparatus stored in the data processing apparatus; but not transmitting the electronic data stored in the data processing apparatus, to the server apparatus;

Davis teaches a first extraction step of extracting feature information of the electronic data to be output to a printer apparatus stored in the data processing apparatus; (Davis, Column 2, Lines 60-65, extracts watermark from image)

but not transmitting the electronic data stored in the data processing apparatus, to the server apparatus; (Davis, Column 2, Lines 60-65 and Column 3, Lines 4-10)

Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of Davis into Wu. Wu teaches sending the entire document with the watermark on it to the server for verification. It would be far more efficient to just send the watermark only since the server is not verifying the document but the watermark. As Davis teaches the beneficial use of only sending the watermark would reduce use of valuable bandwidth.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine the two references to obtain the invention in Claim 1.

4.   As per Claim 9, Wu in view of Davis teaches a *data* processing method according to Claim 1, wherein said control step adds the feature information to the print data as a digital watermark. (Wu, Paragraph [0039] and [0041], server's data is digital)

Analysis is analogous to that made in Claim 1.

5.   As per Claim 10, Wu in view of Davis teaches a data processing method according to Claim 1, wherein said control step adds area information, for inputting signature information, to the print data. (Wu, Paragraph [0036])

        Analysis is analogous to that made in Claim 1.

6.   As per Claim 11, Wu in view of Davis teaches a data processing method according to Claim 10, further comprising a step of *extracting* a signature image drawn in the area information added in said control step, and transmitting the extracted signature image to the server apparatus. (Davis, Column 2, Lines 60-65 and Column 3, Lines 4-10)

        Analysis is analogous to that made in Claim 10.

7.   As per claim 12, Wu in view of Davis teaches a data processing method according to Claim 1, further comprising a step of, when reprinting is requested by the data processing apparatus, (Wu, Paragraph[0054], reprinting is simply printing another copy; there are limited number of copies that can be printed) notifying the data processing apparatus of administration information to be added to the electronic data, by referring the original specifying information transmitted from the data processing apparatus and the original specifying information registered in the storage unit. (Wu, Paragraph [0045]-[0046], notifying the server that the watermark is to be added to the printed document, administrative information can be the watermark)

        Analysis is analogous to that made in Claim 1.

8.   As per claim 13, Wu in view of Davis teaches a data processing method according to
Claim 12, further comprising a confirmation step of, when the reprinting is requested by the data
processing apparatus, confirming determination as to whether or not to perform the printing by
referring restriction information. (Wu, Paragraph[0054] - [0057], the license key used to enable
the printing expires therefore is considered the restriction that the key must be active.)

        Analysis is analogous to that made in Claim 12.

9.   As per Claim 14, Wu in view of Davis teaches a data processing method according to
Claim 13, wherein the restriction information indicates the maximum number of printing
of the electronic data or an upper limit value of the number of printing of the electronic data.
(Wu, Paragraph[0054], the license key used to enable the printing limits the number of copies
that can be made)

        Analysis is analogous to that made in Claim 13.

10.   As per Claim 15, Wu in view of Davis teaches a data processing method according to
Claim 13, wherein the restriction information is original specifying information for specifying a
user other than registered users who can print the electronic data. (Wu, Paragraph[0054] -
[0057], the license key is sent to a recipient and does not need to be registered as long as the user
has certain information to access server)

        Analysis is analogous to that made in Claim 13.

11.   As per Claim 16, Wu in view of Davis teaches a data processing method
according to Claim 13, wherein the restriction information indicates a date or a time when the

electronic data can be printed. (Wu, Paragraph [0057], the license key has an expiration date therefore there is a time frame when the data can be printed)

Analysis is analogous to that made in Claim 13.

12.   Claims 2-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu et al. US2002/0042884 hereinafter referred to as Wu and view of Davis et al. USPN 6965682 hereinafter referred to as Davis as applied to Claim 1 and further in view of Matsumoto et al. JP2001-167086 hereinafter referred to as Matsumoto provided in the Applicant's IDS.

13.   As per Claim 2, Wu in view of Davis teaches a data processing method according to Claim 1, further comprising:

a second extraction step of extracting additional information included in an original certification print image to be output to the printer apparatus based on the print data generated in said control step; (Wu, Paragraph [0026] – [0034]; there is multiple information that can be extracted from the data)

a second transmission step of transmitting to the server apparatus update information including the additional information extracted in said second extraction step, a new feature information extracted from new electronic data in said first extraction step, the feature information and the user ID; (Wu, Paragraph [0026], the server uses a third party for document verification. Therefore document must be sent or transmitted to user)

an administration step of receiving the original specifying information *transmitted* from the data processing apparatus, registering the received information in a storage unit, and administrating the registered information; (Wu, Paragraph [0113] and [0117], sends information such as serial number and time to the server and is stored)

and a notification step of, when original certification printing is requested by the data
processing apparatus, (Wu, Paragraph [0127])

notifying the data processing apparatus of the original certification information to be
added to the electronic data, by referring the original specifying information transmitted from the
data processing apparatus and the original specifying information registered in the storage unit.
(Wu, Paragraph [0045]-[0046], notifying the server that the watermark is to be added to the
printed document)

Wu in view of Davis does not teach an update step of updating the content of the
original specifying information, by verifying the update information transmitted from the data
processing apparatus and the original specifying information; However Matsumoto teaches it.
(Matsumoto, Paragraph [0015])

Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the
invention was made to implement the teachings of Matsumoto into Wu in view of Davis. Wu in
view of Davis teaches transferring the watermark information and some administrative data to
the server to be stored and compared to an existing entry located in the server's memory. This is
done for verification purposes and also to speed up the verification process. By updating the
information in the server will allow future verification purposes to be executed efficiently as
proposed by Davis. Also it will improve the execution of the system by recording additional
specifying information to the server.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine the three
references to obtain the invention in Claim 2.

14.   As per Claim 3, Wu in view of Davis and Matsumoto teaches a data processing method
according to Claim 2, wherein said administration step performs file administration of the
original specifying information and administration information of the original specifying
information. (Wu, Paragraph [0043] and [0044], file administration is considered leaving a
record at the server)

Analysis is analogous to that made in Claim 2.

15.   As per Claim 4, Wu in view of Davis and Matsumoto teaches a data processing method according to Claim 2, wherein said update step updates administration information stored in the storage unit. (Matsumoto, Paragraph [0015])

Analysis is analogous to that made in Claim 2.

16.   As per Claim 5, Wu in view of Davis and Matsumoto teaches a data processing method according to Claim 4, wherein the administration information includes a registration number, a registration date, version information, an update history and a confirmation history for administrating the original specifying information. (Wu, Paragraph [0043] and [0044], [0113], and [0117], file administration is considered leaving a record at the server with information also known as audit trail.)

Analysis is analogous to that made in Claim 4.

17.   As per Claim 6, Wu in view of Davis and Matsumoto teaches a data processing method according to Claim 2, wherein said update step updates any one of a, a feature information(Matsumoto, Paragraph [0015]), version information, registered registration date, and an update history included in the information stored in the storage unit. (Wu, Paragraph [0043] and [0044], [0113], and [0117])

Analysis is analogous to that made in Claim 2.

18.   As per Claim 7, Wu in view of Davis and Matsumoto teaches a data processing method according to Claim 2, further comprising:

a confirmation step of, when original confirmation is requested by the data processing apparatus, confirming originality of the original specifying information by referring the original specifying information *transmitted* from the data processing apparatus and the original specifying information registered in the storage unit; (Wu, Paragraph [0045]-[0046], notifying the server that the watermark is to be added to the printed document, administrative information can be the watermark) and a confirmation notification step of notifying the data processing apparatus of a confirmation result in said confirmation step. (Wu, Paragraph [0026])

Analysis is analogous to that made in Claim 2.

19.   As per claim 8, Wu in view of Davis and Matsumoto teaches a data processing method according Claim 2, wherein the storage unit stores, as administration information, information specifying a date when the feature information is recorded. (Wu, Paragraph [0056])

Analysis is analogous to that made in Claim 2.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MING HON whose telephone number is (571)270-5245. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon- Fri 7:30 to 5:00 EST; 1st Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark K. Zimmerman can be reached on (571)272-7653. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/M. H./
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/Mark K Zimmerman/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625